arXiv:1411.0486v1 [hep-ph] 3 Nov 2014

Analysis of the Crystal Ball data on $K^-p \to \pi^0\Sigma^0$ reaction with center-of-mass energies of $1536 \sim 1676$ MeV

Jun Shi[1] and Bing-Song Zou[2,1]

[1] *Institute of High Energy Physics and Theoretical Physics Center for Sciences Facilities, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

[2] *State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics China, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190,China*

Abstract

With an effective Lagrangian approach, we analyze the $K^-p \to \pi^0\Sigma^0$ reaction to study the Λ hyperon resonances by fitting the Crystal Ball data on differential cross sections and Σ^0 polarization with the center-of-mass energies of $1536 \sim 1676$ MeV. Besides well established PDG 4-star Λ resonances around this energy range, the $\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance, listed as a 3-star resonance in PDG, is found to be definitely needed. In addition, there is strong evidence for the existence of a new $\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^+)$ resonance around 1680 MeV.

PACS numbers: 13.75.-n, 13.75.Cs, 14.20.Gk, 25.75.Dw

I. INTRODUCTION

The $\overline{K}N$ scattering interaction has been widely used to study the hyperon resonances. In our previous work [1, 2], we have analyzed the $K^-N \to \pi\Lambda$ to study the Σ resonances, now we move forward to study the pure isospin-0 reaction $K^-p \to \pi^0\Sigma^0$ to learn structures of the Λ resonances.

Many studies have been carried out to investigate the Λ resonances. Oset et al. [3, 4] used a chiral unitary approach for the meson-baryon interactions and got two $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^-$ resonances with one mass near 1390 MeV and the other around 1420 MeV. They believe the well established $\Lambda(1405)\frac{1}{2}^-$ resonance listed in PDG [5] is actually a superposition of these two $\frac{1}{2}^-$ resonances. Manley et al. [6] and Kamano et al. [7] made multichannel partial-wave analysis of $\overline{K}N$ reactions and got results with some significant differences. Zhong et al. [8] analyzed the $K^-p \to \pi^0\Sigma^0$ reaction with the chiral-quark model and discussed characteristics of the well established Λ resonances. Liu et al. [9] analyzed the $K^-p \to \eta\Lambda$ reaction with an effective Lagrangian approach and implied a D03 resonance with mass about 1670 MeV but much smaller width compared with the well established $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$. So there are still some ambiguities of the Λ resonant structures needing to be clarified.

Recently, the most precise data on the differential cross sections for the $K^-p \to \pi^0\Sigma^0$ reaction have been provided by the Crystal Ball experiment at AGS/BNL [10, 11]. The Σ^0 polarization data were presented for the first time. However, with different data selection cuts and reconstructions, two groups in the same collaboration, *i.e.*, VA group [10] and UCLA group [11], got inconsistent results for the Σ^0 polarizations. Previous multi-channel analysis-[6–8] of the $\overline{K}N$ reactions failed to reproduce either set of the polarization data.

In the present work, instead of performing some sophisticated multi-channel analysis to stuck into various problems, as the first step, we concentrate on the most precise data by the Crystal Ball collaboration on the pure isospin scalar channel of $\overline{K}N$ reaction to see what are the Λ resonances the data demand and how the two groups' distinct polarization data [10, 11] influence the spectroscopy of Λ resonances. Consistent differential cross sections of earlier work by Armenteros et al. [12] at lower energies are also used.

This work is organized as follows. In Sec. II we present our theoretical evaluating procedure of the analysis. In Sec. III we show our study results and give relevant discussions. Finally, a brief summary is organized in Sec. IV.

II. THEORETICAL FORMALISM

For the reaction $K^- p \to \pi^0 \Sigma^0$, the basic contributions come from the t-channel K^* exchange, u-channel proton exchange, s-channel Λ and its resonances contributions. The corresponding Feynman diagrams are shown in Fig. 1. In addition to the t-channel and u-channel contributions, the s-channel contributions from five well established 4-star Λ and its resonances listed in PDG [5] $\Lambda(1115)\frac{1}{2}^+$, $\Lambda(1405)\frac{1}{2}^-$, $\Lambda(1520)\frac{3}{2}^-$, $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$ and $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ are always included in our analysis.



FIG. 1: Feynman diagrams for $K^- p \to \pi^0 \Sigma^0$: (a) t-channel K^* exchange; (b) u-channel proton exchange; (c) s-channel Λ and its resonances exchanges.

In the t-channel K^* exchange process, the effective Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}_{K^*K\pi} = i g_{K^*K\pi} K^*_\mu (\pi \cdot \tau \partial^\mu K - \partial^\mu \pi \cdot \tau K) \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{K^*N\Sigma} = -g_{K^*N\Sigma} \overline{\Sigma} (\gamma_\mu K^{*\mu} - \frac{\kappa_{K^*N\Sigma}}{2M_N} \sigma_{\mu\nu} \partial^\nu K^{*\mu}) N \quad (2)$$

The $K^*K\pi$ coupling constant can be calculated from the decay width of $K^* \to K\pi$, getting $g_{K^*K\pi} = -3.23$. As for the $K^*N\Sigma$ couplings, Refs.[13, 14] gave two sets of values:

$$g_{K^*N\Sigma} = -2.46, \quad \kappa_{K^*N\Sigma} = -0.47 \ (NSC97a),$$
$$g_{K^*N\Sigma} = -3.52, \quad \kappa_{K^*N\Sigma} = -1.14 \ (NSC97f)$$

Thus we limit $g_{K^*N\Sigma}$ to be between -3.52 and -2.46, and $\kappa_{K^*N\Sigma}$ to be between -1.14 and -0.47.

The u-channel proton exchange Lagrangian is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\pi NN} = \frac{g_{\pi NN}}{2M_N} \overline{N} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 \partial_\mu \pi \cdot \tau N \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{KN\Sigma} = \frac{g_{KN\Sigma}}{M_N + M_\Sigma} \overline{\Sigma} \cdot \tau \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 N \partial_\mu \overline{K} \quad (4)$$

where $g_{\pi NN} = 13.45$ and $g_{KN\Sigma} = 2.69$ from the SU(3) symmetry [15]. We allow a factor between $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\sqrt{2}$ to multiply to $g_{\pi NN}g_{KN\Sigma}$ for consideration of SU(3) symmetry breaking effect.

For the s-channel Λ resonances exchanges with different J^P, the effective Lagrangians are

$$\mathcal{L}_{KN\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^+)} = \frac{g_{KN\Lambda}}{M_N + M_\Lambda}\partial_\mu \overline{K\Lambda}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 N + H.c. \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^+)\pi\Sigma} = \frac{g_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma}}{M_\Lambda + M_\Sigma}\overline{\Sigma}\cdot\partial_\mu\bar{\pi}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5\Lambda + H.c. \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{KN\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^-)} = -ig_{KN\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^-)}\overline{K\Lambda}N + H.c. \quad (7)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^-)\pi\Sigma} = -ig_{\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^-)\pi\Sigma}\overline{\Lambda}\pi\cdot\Sigma + H.c. \quad (8)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{KN\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^+)} = \frac{f_{KN\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^+)}}{m_K}\partial_\mu\overline{K\Lambda}^\mu N + H.c. \quad (9)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^+)\Lambda\pi} = \frac{f_{\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^+)\pi\Sigma}}{m_\pi}\partial_\mu\overline{\pi}\cdot\overline{\Sigma}\Lambda^\mu + H.c. \quad (10)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{KN\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^-)} = \frac{f_{KN\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^-)}}{m_K}\partial_\mu\overline{K\Lambda}^\mu\gamma_5 N + H.c. \quad (11)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^-)\pi\Sigma} = \frac{f_{\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^-)\pi\Sigma}}{m_\pi}\partial_\mu\pi\overline{\Lambda}^\mu\gamma_5\Sigma + H.c. \quad (12)$$

For $\Lambda(1115)\frac{1}{2}^+$, the SU(3) flavor symmetry predict $g_{KN\Lambda} = -13.98$ and $g_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma} = 9.32$. Considering SU(3) symmetry breaking effect, we multiply a tunable factor ranged from $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ to $\sqrt{2}$ to $g_{KN\Lambda}g_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma}$.

For the $\Lambda(1405)\frac{1}{2}^-$, we adopt the PDG [5] estimated mass and width for it, *i.e.*, 1405.1 MeV and 50MeV, respectively. Its coupling to $\pi\Sigma$ is obtained from its decay width to be $g_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma} = 0.9$. Since $\Lambda(1405)$ is below the K^-p threshold, $g_{KN\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^-)}$ cannot be directly evaluated from the decay approach. Nevertheless, there are many theoretical works on this parameter. Williams [16] gave a upper limit for $g_{KN\Lambda(1405)}$ of 3.0 obtained from hadronic scattering. The work of two-pole structure for $\Lambda(1405)$ by Oset et al. [3] gives $|g_{\overline{K}N\Lambda}| = 2.1$ for the lower resonance and $|g_{\overline{K}N\Lambda}| = 2.7$ for the upper resonance. By using a separable potential model [17], Xie [18] gave $g^2_{KN\Lambda(1405)}/4\pi = 0.27$, *i.e.*, $g_{\Lambda(1405)\overline{K}N} = 1.84$ at the $\overline{K}N$ threshold. In Ref.[15], Xie et.al. gave $g_{\Lambda(1405)\overline{K}N} = 0.77$ and $g_{\Lambda(1405)\overline{K}N} = 1.51$ from two different fitting procedures. In our analysis, we set $g_{\Lambda(1405)\overline{K}N}$ to be a free parameter.

As listed in PDG [5], $\Lambda(1520)\frac{3}{2}^-$ has very narrow ranges of its mass, width and branching ratios to $\overline{K}N$ and $\pi\Sigma$, we fix its mass to be $1519.5MeV$ and coupling constants $f_{KN\Lambda} = 10.5$ and $f_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma} = 2.12$. We use the energy dependent width of $\Lambda(1520)$, which contains the Blatt-Weisskopf barrier factor [19, 20]

$$\Gamma(\sqrt{s}) = \Gamma_0 \sum_i \left[c_i \frac{p^3_{B_i}(\sqrt{s}) M_{\Lambda^*} (E_{B_i}(\sqrt{s}) - M_{B_i}) B_2^2(p_{B_i}(\sqrt{s}))}{p^3_{B_i}(M_{\Lambda^*}) \sqrt{s} (E_{B_i}(M_{\Lambda^*}) - M_{B_i}) B_2^2(p_{B_i}(M_{\Lambda^*}))} \right] \Big/ \sum_j c_j \qquad (13)$$

where s is the invariant mass of K^-p system, $\Gamma_0 = 15.6\ MeV$, c_i is the branching ratio to the i-th final state, $c_{\overline{K}N} = 0.45$, and $c_{\pi\Sigma} = 0.42$ [5]. $p_{B_i}(W)$ and $E_{B_i}(W)$ represent the magnitude of the three momentum and energy of the baryon in the decayed final system, respectively, *i.e.*, $p^2_{B_i}(W) = \frac{(W^2 + M^2_{B_i} - m^2_{M_i})^2}{4W^2} - M^2_{B_i}$ and $E_{B_i}(W) = \sqrt{p^2_{B_i}(W) + M^2_{B_i}}$. $B_2(Q) = \sqrt{\frac{13}{Q^4 + 3Q^2Q_0^2 + 9Q_0^4}}$ is the Blatt-Weisskopf barrier factor [19, 20] for $l = 2$, and Q_0 is a hadron "scale" parameter as a tunable parameter ranging from 0.5 to 1.5 in our analysis.

The $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$ and $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ coupling constants can be deduced from their relevant decays widths to $\overline{K}N$ and $\Sigma\pi$ as listed in PDG [5]. Taking into account of their uncertainties, we constrain $g_{\Lambda(1670)\pi\Sigma} g_{KN\Lambda(1670)}$ to be in the range of $0.04 \sim 0.2$, and $f_{KN\Lambda} f_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma}$ in the range of $2.85 \sim 7.62$ in our fitting. Their masses and widths are also tunable parameters.

At each vertex, an off-shell form factor is used. For the t-channel K^* meson exchange, we use the form factor

$$F_{K^*}(p^2_{K^*}) = \left(\frac{\Lambda^2 - m^2_{K^*}}{\Lambda^2 - p^2_{K^*}} \right)^2, \qquad (14)$$

where m_{K^*}, p_{K^*} and Λ are the mass, 4-momenta, and cut-off parameter for the exchanged K^*.

For the u-channel and s-channel baryon exchanges, the off-shell form factor is in the form

$$F_B(q^2, M) = \frac{\Lambda^4}{\Lambda^4 + (q^2 - M^2)^2} \qquad (15)$$

where M, q and Λ stand for the mass, 4-momenta and cut-off factor of the exchanged baryon. The cut-off parameter is constrained between 0.8 and 1.5 for all channels.

The propagator for the vector meson K^* exchange is

$$G_{K^*}(p_{K^*}) = \frac{-g^{\mu\nu} + p^\mu_{K^*} p^\nu_{K^*} / m^2_{K^*}}{p^2_{K^*} - m^2_{K^*}} \qquad (16)$$

For the u-channel proton exchange, the propagator is

$$G_B(q) = \frac{\not{q} + m}{q^2 - m^2}. \qquad (17)$$

For the s-channel $\Lambda(1115)$ exchange, the expression of the propagator is

$$G_B(q) = \frac{\not{q} + \sqrt{s}}{q^2 - m^2}. \tag{18}$$

While for other Λ unstable resonances, the propagators are in the Breit-Weigner forms

$$G_R^{\frac{1}{2}}(q) = \frac{\not{q} + \sqrt{s}}{q^2 - M^2 + iM\Gamma} \tag{19}$$

$$G_R^{\frac{3}{2}}(q) = \frac{\not{q} + \sqrt{s}}{q^2 - M^2 + iM\Gamma}(-g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu}{3} + \frac{\gamma^\mu q^\nu - \gamma^\nu q^\mu}{3\sqrt{s}} + \frac{2q^\mu q^\nu}{3s}) \tag{20}$$

where Γ is the total width of the resonance and s is the square of the invariant mass of K^-p system.

The differential cross section for $K^-p \to \pi^0\Sigma^0$ in the center of mass frame is

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} = \frac{1}{64\pi^2 s}\frac{|\mathbf{k}'|}{|\mathbf{k}|}\overline{|\mathcal{M}|}^2, \tag{21}$$

where $d\Omega = 2\pi d\cos\theta$, and θ is the angle between K^- and π^0 in the center of mass frame. $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{k}'$ represent the three-momenta of K^- and π^0 in the c.m. frame, respectively. The amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ and its averged square can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\lambda'} = u^{\lambda'}_{\Sigma^0}(p')\mathcal{A}u^{\lambda}_p(p) = u^{\lambda'}_{\Sigma^0}(p')\sum_i \mathcal{A}_i u^{\lambda}_p(p) \tag{22}$$

$$\overline{|\mathcal{M}|}^2 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\lambda,\lambda'}\mathcal{M}_{\lambda,\lambda'}\mathcal{M}^\dagger_{\lambda,\lambda'} = \frac{1}{2}Tr\left[(\not{p}' + M_{\Sigma^0})\mathcal{A}(\not{p} + M_p)\gamma^0\mathcal{A}^\dagger\gamma^0\right] \tag{23}$$

where p and p' represent the 4-momenta of proton and Σ^0 separately, λ and λ' stands for the spin index of proton and Σ^0, respectively. $\mathcal{A}$ is the total amplitude despite the spin functions and $\mathcal{A}_i$ denotes the i-th channel partial contribution.

The Σ^0 polarization is in the form [21]

$$P_{\Sigma^0} = 2Im\left(\mathcal{M}_{\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}\mathcal{M}^*_{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}}\right)/\overline{|\mathcal{M}|}^2. \tag{24}$$

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The analyzed experimental data are from Armenteros et al. [12], the VA group [10] and the UCLA group [11] of the Crystal Ball collaboration. The differential cross section data of these three references are shown in Fig. 2. We can see that the differential cross sections

from the VA group and the UCLA group of CB are compatible with each other, while some data points from Ref.[12] diverge from those of the two CB groups, but with large error bars. Fig.3 shows the total cross section data of the three references. The total cross sections of the VA group and the UCLA group of CB can be smoothly extended from the 4 lower-momentum data of Ref.[12]. So we will use the 4 low-momentum differential cross section data together with those from VA group and UCLA group of CB [10, 11].



FIG. 2: The differential cross sections from Ref.[12], the VA group [10] and the UCLA group [11] of the Crystal Ball collaboration at similar beam momenta.



FIG. 3: The total cross sections from Ref.[12], the VA group [10] and the UCLA group [11].

Considering the distinct polarization results of the VA group and the UCLA group, we will

first only fit the differential cross sections given consistently by three experimental groups. Then we will separately deal with the differential cross sections either with the VA group polarization data or the polarization data of the UCLA group.

Our fitting procedure is as follows. Firstly we include the t-channel K^*, u-channel proton and s-channel the well-established $\Lambda(1115)$ and its resonances $\Lambda(1405)\frac{1}{2}^-$, $\Lambda(1520)\frac{3}{2}^-$, $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$ and $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ contributions, which contains 18 tunable parameters, and give the results. Secondly we discuss the results by including an additional Λ resonance with $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^+$, $\frac{1}{2}^-$, $\frac{3}{2}^+$ or $\frac{3}{2}^-$ to s-channel. Then we try to add additional 2, 3, and 4 Λ resonances to see the improvement of the description of the experimental data. Including an additional resonance increases the tunable parameters by 4, *i.e.*, the cut-off parameter, mass, width and product of coupling constants to $\overline{K}N$ and $\pi\Sigma$ of the resonance.

A. Results of fitting only the differential cross section data from Refs.[10–12]

When only fitting the 236 differential cross section data points of Refs.[10–12], the fit without adding additional Λ resonance in s-channel has $\chi^2 = 1565$. The fit compared with the experimental data is shown in Fig. 4 by the dashed lines.

When adding one additional resonance, the best fit is to add a $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance, with mass around 1582 MeV, width about 142 MeV, leading to a $\chi^2 = 654$. The fitting results are shown in Fig. 4. The fitted parameters and uncertainties for $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$, $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$, and the added $\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^+)$ of this solution are shown in Table I. The fitted couplings for t-channel K^*, u-channel proton and s-channel $\Lambda(1115)$ and $\Lambda(1405)$ are shown in Table II.

Instead of the $\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance, when adding a $\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance, the χ^2 is 687, with the resonance's mass about 1526 MeV and width near 43 MeV. The other results for adding one additional resonance are $\chi^2 = 1029$ for adding one $J^P = \frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance and $\chi^2 = 885$ for adding one $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^-$ resonance.

When adding two additional resonances, the lowest χ^2 equaling 540 is given by adding a $\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance and a $\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance. The parameters for the $\frac{1}{2}^+$resonance are mass around 1604 ± 3.3 MeV, width about 248 ± 3.4 MeV, and coupling $\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot} = -0.31 \pm 0.02$. The $\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance's mass, width and branching ratio are 1535 ± 3.3 MeV, 29 ± 8 MeV, and $\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot} = -0.11 \pm 0.02$, respectively.

The second lowest result for adding two additional resonances is to add a $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance



FIG. 4: (Color online) Fit compared with differential cross section data from Refs.[10–12]. The dashed lines show results with inclusion of only five 4-star Λ resonances in s-channel; the blue solid lines represent the results of including an additional $\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^+)$ resonance.

TABLE I: Fitted parameters of $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$, $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ and the additional $\Lambda(\frac{1}{2}^+)$ for the lowest χ^2 result when adding one additional resonance.

	mass(MeV)(PDG estimate)	Γ_{tot}(MeV)(PDG estimate)	$\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot}$ (PDG range)
$\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$	1701.8 ± 3.5(1660,1680)	127.9 ± 1(25,50)	-0.38 ± 0.043(-0.38,-0.23)
$\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$	1683.8 ± 1.5(1685,1695)	42.4 ± 4.8(50,70)	-0.228 ± 0.037(-0.34,-0.25)
$\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$	1581.7 ± 32(1560, 1700)	142.5 ± 4.5(50,250)	-0.365 ± 0.01(-0.33,0.28)

TABLE II: Fitted coupling constants for t-channel, u-channel, s-channel $\Lambda(1115)$ and $\Lambda(1405)\frac{1}{2}^-$.

$g_{K^*N\Sigma}$ (Model)	$g_{K^*N\Sigma}\kappa_{K^*N\Sigma}$ (Model)	$g_{\pi NN}g_{KN\Sigma}$ [SU(3)]	$g_{KN\Lambda}g_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma}$ [SU(3)]	$g_{KN\Lambda^*}g_{\Lambda^*\pi\Sigma}$
-3.52 ± 0.69(-3.52, -2.46)	-1.14 ± 0.06(-1.14,-0.47)	33.76 ± 1.73(36.18)	92.06 ± 4.7(130.3)	2.97 ± 0.15

in additional to the $\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance, leading a χ^2 of 546, which is very close to the result by adding a $\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance in addition to the $\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance. The fitted parameters for the $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance are mass about 1680 ± 0.8 MeV, width near 39 ± 1.3 MeV, and branching ratio $\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot} = 0.11 \pm 0.003$. Meanwhile, the mass, width and couplings of $\frac{1}{2}^+$ are shifted to 1574 ± 0.4 MeV, 132 ± 0.7 MeV, and $\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot} = -0.34 \pm 0.001$.

The best result for adding 3 resonances is to add one $\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance, one $\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance, and one $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance, with the χ^2 equaling 418 for the 236 experimental data. The adjusted parameters for the established $\Lambda(1670)$ and $\Lambda(1690)$ together with the additional three resonances are shown in Table III.

TABLE III: Fitted parameters when additionally adding a $\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance, a $\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance, and a $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance for the result with $\chi^2 = 418$.

	mass(MeV) (PDG estimate)	Γ_{tot}(MeV)(PDG estimate)	$\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot}$ (PDG range)
$\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$	1662.6 ± 0.5(1660,1680)	50 ± 18.3(25,50)	-0.21 ± 0.004(-0.38,-0.23)
$\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$	1695 ± 28.8(1685,1695)	60.3 ± 9.1(50,70)	-0.051 ± 0.015(-0.34,-0.25)
$\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$	1574.7 ± 0.5 (1560, 1700)	81.9 ± 1.1 (50,250)	-0.265 ± 0.002 (-0.33,0.28)
additional $\frac{3}{2}^-$	1513.6 ± 0.8	230 ± 2.2	-0.064 ± 0.0003
additional $\frac{3}{2}^+$	1682.3 ± 0.8	132 ± 0.9	0.287 ± 0.002

Since adding these additional resonances significantly reduces the contribution of $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$, we examine whether it is really needed by the data. It is found that dropping the $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ only increases the χ^2 by 1 to be 419, while dropping any other resonance will increase the χ^2 by more than 120. This indicates that the $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ is indeed not needed by the data. The fitted parameters are shown in Table IV.

Further, when we replace the $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance by the well established $\Lambda(1890)\frac{3}{2}^+$ with mass from 1850 to 1910 MeV and width from 60 to 200 MeV [5], the χ^2 is 512. The fitted parameters of the five resonances are shown in Table V. This demonstrates that the new $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance around 1680 MeV cannot be replaced by the well established $\Lambda(1890)\frac{3}{2}^+$.

The best fit by adding 4 additional resonances has $\chi^2 = 403$, by adding two $\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonances, one $\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance and one $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance. Their fitted parameters are shown in Table VI. The two $\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonances strongly overlap and can be regarded as some modification to the shape

TABLE IV: Fitted parameters with $\chi^2 = 419$ when dropping $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$.

	mass(MeV) (PDG estimate)	Γ_{tot}(MeV)(PDG estimate)	$\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot}$ (PDG range)
$\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$	1660.9 ± 0.4(1660,1680)	48.3 ± 0.8(25,50)	-0.22 ± 0.003(-0.38,-0.23)
$\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$	1576.3 ± 0.5 (1560, 1700)	80.7 ± 1.1 (50,250)	-0.273 ± 0.002 (-0.33,0.28)
additional $\frac{3}{2}^-$	1511.2 ± 1	256 ± 2.9	-0.054 ± 0.003
additional $\frac{3}{2}^+$	1679.8 ± 0.7	115.3 ± 0.8	0.295 ± 0.002

$g_{K^*N\Sigma}$ (Model)	$g_{K^*N\Sigma}\kappa_{K^*N\Sigma}$ (Model)	$g_{\pi NN}g_{KN\Sigma}$ [SU(3)]	$g_{KN\Lambda}g_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma}$ [SU(3)]	$g_{KN\Lambda^*}g_{\Lambda^*\pi\Sigma}$
-2.46 ± 1.06(-3.52, -2.46)	-0.52 ± 0.37(-1.14,-0.47)	51.2 ± 24.1(36.18)	92.1 ± 59.6(130.3)	2.49 ± 0.02

TABLE V: Fitted resonance parameters with $\chi^2 = 512$ when replacing the new $3/2^+$ resonance by $\Lambda(1890)\frac{3}{2}^+$.

	mass(MeV)(PDG estimate)	Γ_{tot}(MeV)(PDG estimate)	$\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot}$ (PDG range)
$\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$	1670.9 ± 0.5(1660,1680)	50 ± 1.2 (25,50)	-0.19 ± 0.006(-0.38,-0.23)
$\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$	1695 ± 1.6(1685,1695)	70 ± 13.1 (50,70)	-0.165 ± 0.005(-0.34,-0.25)
$\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$	1563.2 ± 0.2(1560, 1700)	159 ± 0.4(50,250)	-0.337 ± 0.001(-0.33,0.28)
$\Lambda(1890)\frac{3}{2}^+$	1850 ± 0.5 (1850,1910)	200 ± 0.1(60,200)	0.99 ± 0.002
additional $\frac{3}{2}^-$	1558.3 ± 0.9	130.6 ± 2.8	-0.05 ± 0.0002

TABLE VI: Fitted parameters for the best fit of $\chi^2 = 403$ when adding 4 additional resonances.

J^P	mass(MeV)	Γ_{tot}(MeV)	$\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot}$
$\frac{1}{2}^+$	1580.3 ± 1.3	67.8 ± 2.6	-0.24 ± 0.002
$\frac{1}{2}^+$	1544.8 ± 1	36.3 ± 2.5	-0.21 ± 0.006
$\frac{3}{2}^-$	1505.2 ± 1.4	274.4 ± 2.2	-0.049 ± 0.0002
$\frac{3}{2}^+$	1680.7 ± 1.1	144.9 ± 2.3	0.281 ± 0.002



FIG. 5: (Color online) The most favored fit (red solid lines) to differential cross section data from Refs.[10–12], and corresponding prediction to the polarizations compared with data of Refs.[10, 11]. As comparison, fits by dropping the $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance or replacing it by $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ are shown with blue dashed and black dot-dashed lines, respectively.

of one resonance. Moreover, the fit improves χ^2 only by 15 with 4 additional parameters. This suggests that no evidence for any more resonances from the data.

From our above investigation, we regard the fit given in Table IV as our most favored fit to the CB data on the differential cross sections. In this most favored fit, the PDG 4-star resonance $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$ and 3-star resonance $\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$ are definitely needed with fitted parameters compatible with PDG values; the PDG 4-star resonance $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ is dropped, replaced by a new $\Lambda(1680)\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance; an additional broad $3/2^-$ contribution couples to

this channel weakly and may be regarded as modification to the tail of $\Lambda(1520)\frac{3}{2}^-$. The fitted results of this most favored solution are shown in Fig. 5, together with the predicted polarizations of this solution compared with two sets of CB polarization data Refs.[10, 11]. The predicted polarizations are more inclined to the data by VA group [10]. As comparison, fits by dropping the $\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance with $\chi^2 = 763$ or replacing it by $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ with $\chi^2 = 540$ are also shown in Fig. 5 by blue dashed and black dot-dashed lines, respectively.

Since the two sets of CB polarization data Refs.[10, 11] are not consistent with each other, we will examine how each set of the polarization data influences our solution separately in the following two subsections.

B. Fitting the differential cross sections of Refs. [10–12] and polarization data from the VA group of CB [10]

Based on our most favored solution in last subsection, we refit the data by including the polarization data from the VA group of CB [10]. The χ^2 is 550 for the 308 experimental data. The refitted parameters of $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$ and the three additional resonances as well as the couplings for t-channel K^*, u-channel proton and s-channel $\Lambda(1115)$ and $\Lambda(1405)$ are shown in Table VII, The fits compared with data are shown in Fig. 6.

TABLE VII: Refitted parameters for our most favored solution with $\chi^2 = 550$ when including polarization data from the VA group of CB [10].

	mass(MeV)(PDG estimate)	Γ_{tot}(MeV)(PDG estimate)	$\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot}$ (PDG range)
$\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$	1662.5 ± 0.3(1660,1680)	50 ± 0.7 (25,50)	-0.29 ± 0.003(-0.38,-0.23)
$\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$	1575.2 ± 0.6(1560, 1700)	94.8 ± 1(50,250)	-0.293 ± 0.002(-0.33,0.28)
additional $\frac{3}{2}^-$	1506.9 ± 1.4	334.4 ± 3.4	-0.04 ± 0.002
additional $\frac{3}{2}^+$	1687.7 ± 1	112.7 ± 0.8	0.297 ± 0.002

$g_{K^*N\Sigma}$ (Model)	$g_{K^*N\Sigma}\kappa_{K^*N\Sigma}$ (Model)	$g_{\pi NN}g_{KN\Sigma}$ [SU(3)]	$g_{KN\Lambda}g_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma}$ [SU(3)]	$g_{KN\Lambda^*}g_{\Lambda^*\pi\Sigma}$
-3.52 ± 0.75(-3.52, -2.46)	-1.14 ± 0.11(-1.14,-0.47)	28.8 ± 1.3(36.18)	92.1 ± 9.4(130.3)	2.16 ± 0.03

The refitted parameters are quite similar with those without including the polarization data. Once again, the 4-star resonance $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ is not needed. Adding it into our present



FIG. 6: (Color online) Fits compared with differential cross data of Refs. [10–12] and polarization data of Refs. [10, 11]. The dashed lines represent the result with 4-star resonances only, the blue solid lines stand for the result when adding the 3-star $\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance, and the green solid lines show the result of the most favored solution.

solution only improves χ^2 by 0.5. Improvement by adding any new resonance with other quantum numbers is also insignificant. Dropping either $3/2^-$ or $3/2^+$ resonance in Table VII will increase the χ^2 by more than 100.

C. Fitting the differential cross sections of Refs. [10–12] and polarization data from the UCLA group of CB [11]

If we refit the data using the polarization data from the UCLA group [11] instead of the VA group of CB [10] for our most favored solution, the χ^2 is 881 for the 360 experimental data points. The refitted parameters of $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$ and the three additional resonances as well as the couplings for t-channel K^*, u-channel proton and s-channel $\Lambda(1115)$ and $\Lambda(1405)$ are shown in Table VIII. The fits compared with data are shown in Fig. 7.

TABLE VIII: Refitted parameters for our most favored solution with $\chi^2 = 881$ when when including polarization data from the UCLA group of CB [11].

	mass(MeV)(PDG estimate)	Γ_{tot}(MeV)(PDG estimate)	$\sqrt{\Gamma_{\pi\Sigma}\Gamma_{\overline{K}N}}/\Gamma_{tot}$ (PDG range)
$\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$	1674.2 ± 0.6(1660,1680)	30 ± 1 (25,50)	-0.12 ± 0.004(-0.38,-0.23)
$\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$	1557.1 ± 0.4(1560, 1700)	169.7 ± 0.7(50,250)	-0.36 ± 0.001(-0.33,0.28)
additional $\frac{3}{2}^-$	1585.4 ± 2.4	58.4 ± 4.5	-0.035 ± 0.001
additional $\frac{3}{2}^+$	1665.6 ± 1.1	136.5 ± 3	0.136 ± 0.003

$g_{K^*N\Sigma}$ (Model)	$\kappa_{K^*N\Sigma}$ (Model)	$g_{\pi NN}g_{KN\Sigma}$ [SU(3)]	$g_{KN\Lambda}g_{\Lambda\pi\Sigma}$ [SU(3)]	$g_{KN\Lambda^*}g_{\Lambda^*\pi\Sigma}$
-3.47 ± 0.8(-3.52, -2.46)	-0.92 ± 0.5(-1.14,-0.47)	39.13 ± 0.5(36.18)	92.1 ± 4.6(130.3)	0.5 ± 0.06

Compared with using the polarization data of VA group, the refitted parameters by using the UCLA data have larger difference from those without including the polarization data. Including the 4-star resonance $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ improves χ^2 by 22, still much less significant than other resonances. Dropping the $3/2^+$ or $3/2^-$ resonance in Table VIII will increase the χ^2 by 128 or 68, respectively.

IV. SUMMARY

We have analyzed the $K^-p \to \pi^0\Sigma^0$ reaction using an effective Lagrangian approach. By fitting different sets of experimental data by CB Collaboration, we obtain the following conclusions.



FIG. 7: (Color online) Fits compared with differential cross data of Refs. [10–12] and polarization data of Refs. [10, 11]. The dashed lines represent the result with 4-star resonances only, the blue solid lines stand for the result when adding the 3-star $\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonance, and the green solid lines show the result of our most favored solution.

The 4-star $\Lambda(1670)\frac{1}{2}^-$ and 3-star $\Lambda(1600)\frac{1}{2}^+$ resonances listed in PDG [5] are definitely needed no matter which set of CB data is used. As shown in Table IV for our most favored solution, the fitted parameters for these two resonances are consistent with their PDG values. In addition, there is strong evidence for the existence of a new $\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^+)$ resonance around 1680 MeV. It improves χ^2 by more than 100 no matter which set of data is used. It gives large contribution to this reaction, replacing the contribution from the 4-star $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance included by previous fits to this reaction. Including some broad $3/2^-$ contribution also

improves the χ^2 significantly. It couples to this channel weakly and may be regarded as modification to the tail of $\Lambda(1520)\frac{3}{2}^-$.

Replacing the PDG $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance by a new $\Lambda(1680)\frac{3}{2}^+$ resonance has important implications on hyperon spectroscopy and its underlying dynamics. While the classical qqq constituent quark model [22] predicts the lowest $\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^+)$ resonance to be around 1900 MeV in consistent with the $\Lambda(1890)\frac{3}{2}^+$ listed in PDG, the penta-quark dynamics [23] predicts to be below 1700 MeV in consistent with $\Lambda(1680)\frac{3}{2}^+$ claimed in this work.

A recent analysis [9] of CB data on the $K^-p \to \eta\Lambda$ reaction requires a $\Lambda(\frac{3}{2}^-)$ resonance with mass about 1670 MeV and width about 1.5 MeV instead of the well established $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$ resonance with width around 60 MeV. Together with $N^*(1520)\frac{3}{2}^-$, $\Sigma(1542)\frac{3}{2}^-$ suggested in Ref. [2] and either $\Xi(1620)$ or $\Xi(1690)$, they fit in a nice $3/2^-$ baryon nonet with large penta-quark configuration, *i.e.*, $N^*(1520)$ as $|[ud]\{uq\}\bar{q}>$ state, $\Lambda(1520)$ as $|[ud]\{sq\}\bar{q}>$ state, $\Lambda(1670)$ as $|[ud]\{ss\}\bar{s}>$ state, and $\Xi(16xx)$ as $|[ud]\{ss\}\bar{q}>$ state. Here $\{q_1q_2\}$ means a diquark with configuration of flavor representation **6**, spin 1 and color $\bar{3}$. The $\Lambda(1670)$ as $|[ud]\{ss\}\bar{s}>$ state gives a natural explanation for its dominant $\eta\Lambda$ decay mode with a very narrow width due to its very small phase space meanwhile a D-wave decay [24].

It would be very important to re-check other relevant reactions whether the new claimed $\Lambda(1680)\frac{3}{2}^+$ is also needed there and may replace the PDG well established $\Lambda(1690)\frac{3}{2}^-$. Further precise polarization data for KN reactions would be very helpful to clarify the ambiguities in the determination of spin-parities of these hyperon resonances.

Acknowledgments

Helpful discussions with Bo-Chao Liu, Pu-Ze Gao, Jia-Jun Wu, Ju-Jun Xie, Xu Cao and W. Briscoe are gratefully acknowledged. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants 11035006, 11121092, 11261130311 (CRC110 by DFG and NSFC), the Chinese Academy of Sciences under Project No.KJCX2-EW-N01.

[1] Puze Gao, and B.S. Zou, A. Sibirtsev, Nucl. Phys. **A 867**, 41 (2011).

[2] Puze Gao, Jun Shi, and B.S. Zou, Phys. Rev. **C 86**, 025201 (2012).

[3] D. Jido *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A 725**, 181 (2003).

[4] V. K. Magas, E. Oset, and A. Ramos, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 052301 (2005).

[5] K. A. Olive *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Chin. Phys. C **38**, 090001 (2014).

[6] H. Zhang, J. Tulpan, M. Shrestha, and Manley, Phys. Rev. **C 88**, 035204(2013); Phys. Rev. **C 88**, 035205 (2013).

[7] H. Kamano, S. X. Nakamura, T.-S. H. Lee and T. Sato, arXiv:1407.6839 [nucl-th].

[8] X. H. Zhong and Q. Zhao, Phys. Rev. **C 79**, 045202 (2009); Phys. Rev. **C 88**, 015208 (2013).

[9] B. C. Liu and J. J. Xie, Phys. Rev. **C 85**, 038201 (2012); Phys. Rev. C **86**, 055202 (2012).

[10] R. Manweiler *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C 77**, 015205 (2008).

[11] S. Prakhov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C 80**, 025204 (2009).

[12] R. Armenteros *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B 21**, 15 (1970).

[13] V.G.J. Stoks, and T.A. Rijken, Phys. Rev.**C 59**, 3009 (1999).

[14] Y. Oh, K. Nakayama, and T.-S. H. Lee, Phys. Rept. **423**, 49 (2006).

[15] J. J. Xie, B. C. Liu, and C. S. An, Phys. Rev. **C 88**, 015203 (2013) .

[16] R. A. Williams, C. R. Ji and S. R. Cotanch, Phys. Rev. **C 43** 452 (1991).

[17] N. V. Shevchenko, A. Gal and J. Mareš, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 082301 (2007); N. V. Shevchenko, A. Gal, J. Mareš and J. Revai, Phys. Rev. **C 76**, 044004 (2007).

[18] J. J. Xie, and C. Wilkin, Phys. Rev. **C 82**, 025210 (2010).

[19] B.S. Zou and D.V. Bugg, Eur. Phys. J. **A 16**, 537 (2003).

[20] S. U. Chung, Phys. Rev. **D 48**, 1225 (1993).

[21] G. Penner and U. Mosel, Phys. Rev. **C 66**, 055211 (2002).

[22] S. Capstick and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 2809 (1986); S. Capstick and W. Roberts, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45**, S241 (2000).

[23] C. Helminen and D.O. Riska, Nucl. Phys. **A699**, 624 (2002).

[24] B. S. Zou, Nucl. Phys. A **914**, 454 (2013).